

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 26, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the Gallery. We have a number of visitors whom some of us may have had the pleasure of hearing earlier; 83 members of the Elbow Lake Band of Minnesota in the United States of America. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gordon Peterson. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here this morning.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed). On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): In the absence of the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed). On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I was going to speak on another report, it seemed to me that I couldn't get started, being ruled out of order. However, I will try to do my best this morning in speaking on the motion to receive the Dental Services Report. Not being a member of the committee that heard the various delegations, and apparently there were quite a number that appeared before this committee, and before I say anything further I certainly, Mr. Speaker, would like to get copies of those reports that were presented to that committee so that I could avail myself of that information and be able to speak on the report more intelligently when it comes up for concurrence. Because it seems to me that the members that were on the committee have this material at their disposal and I take it that there were representatives from all the other groups or parties of this House except myself and probably the Member for Churchill, so that I would like to obtain this information, not only on behalf of this report, but I think on behalf of the other reports as well. I was a member of the Committee on Economic Development, so that would not apply in connection with that particular committee.

Mr. Speaker, it appears from the report that a Bill will be presented at a later date which will deal with four parts; the first dealing with the dental profession, then with dental technicians, with dental hygienists and dental mechanics. Not having heard the discussion, I am wondering at this time whether the dental mechanics will be subject to the dentists in this legislation. If that be the case, then I would voice my objection at this point already, because I feel that we can lay down guidelines for the dental technicians, which have up until now been referred to as the denturists, so that they could operate in a certain field without having to be governed by the dentists.

We know from past experiences that a number of people have come across the line from the States, various states within the United States, come up to Manitoba and had dentures made. The cost of these were so much less that they could even pay for their holiday or their stay up here without any extra cost because the dentures sold for that much less in Manitoba. I think it would be wrong for allowing the dentists to take a big rake-off, probably a larger rake-off than the cost of the dentures themselves, because we find this to be the case in drugs - that we have terrific markups in drugs up to 1,000 percent. I don't think we should set up legislation where we would allow the same thing to happen with the dental mechanics. I think we have too many poor people in our province that cannot afford dental services at the present time, and unless the dental services come under medicare many people will have to forego the services of dentists. So that I feel very strongly about this, that whatever legislation will

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) be coming forward that the dental mechanics legislation be not made subjective to the dentists bill or legislation, whatever it may contain.

There are other matters that I could refer to, such as the grandfathers clause which will only take into consideration or be considered for the time of one year in which the people that have been practising will have to comply or register under this new Act once it comes about. Then, too, we find that no longer will they be referred to as professionals but rather craftsmen. I don't take any offense to that so much at this time; I will wait to see just what the legislation will be like when it comes forward. But at any rate, these are my sentiments and my feelings on the report and I do hope when the legislation comes in that it does take these matters into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member is making the request on behalf of the Member for Sturgeon Creek. The honourable member have leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 5, an Act to amend the Winnipeg Charter 1956 and to validate By-law 19680 of the City of Winnipeg; and Bill No. 10 an Act to amend The Optometry Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Department of Youth and Education for the year ending June 30, 1969.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I wonder if he can inform the House why the Centennial Corporation did not wish to involve itself in a commemorative stamp for Manitoba, when they were informed in 1965 that a stamp would be issued?

HON. PHILIP PETURSSON (Minister of Cultural Affairs) (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I was warned that a question would be raised in the House about the commemorative stamp and therefore gathered a little information. I have a file of letters here, correspondence, which shows that Manitoba was not inactive in its approach towards having a commemorative stamp issued. I don't have the information about '65 correspondence from the post office department, but I do have other letters dating back to 1968 and have been informed that there has been an exchange of letters prior to that time between the Centennial Corporation and the Canadian Post Office Department.

October 31, 1968, there was a letter sent to the Post Office Department, to the then Minister who was in charge of the postal services, suggesting that a postage stamp commemorating the Manitoba Centennial be issued. That's on October 31st. Then late in '68 or '69 the former premier of the province, the Honourable Mr. Weir and Mr. Steinkopf interviewed Mr. Klerans about the stamp and I believe that the former minister -- although I don't feel that I have to give any special support or praise to the former government, this is simply a matter of record -- that the former prime minister did issue a statement that was published, a press release early in '69, on January 10, '69 that Manitoba would be recognized in its centennial year with a special issue of a postage stamp. On June 18th, 1969, there was a letter from the post office notifying the corporation that Mr. Lougheed had been commissioned to produce a stamp and in due course that stamp was produced.

Since that time we have received notice that two additional commemorative stamps will be issued; a stamp that is known as the Louis Riel stamp to be issued in June in Montreal, and in that way, giving him national recognition, not only as a Manitoba figure but as a Canadian of historic significance; and also in June there will be a stamp issued commemorating Henry Kelsey who played a large part in the opening up and the exploration of this province. The first

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) day covers are now in the hands of members of the Philatelic Society here in Winnipeg awaiting official issue of that stamp.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the information that I have. I don't know that I have anything further to say in elaboration except to say that the items that have appeared in the newspapers appear to be the result of either misinformation or inadvertent distortion of one kind or another misrepresenting what has been done and what is being done. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, following another emotional outburst by another Minister, that we have just had this discourse, might I ask you, Sir, if you would put this copy of Hansard in a special file so that we would understand the type of question before the Orders of the Day that can be accepted from all sides of the House.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): We'll send you a folder and you keep your own file.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the First Minister yesterday respecting the appointment to the Board of the Manitoba Development Fund which he did not wish to answer, but I understand that the information has been given by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the hallways of the building. Perhaps could we now have an answer to the question.

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I think that my answer still stands, although the Minister of Industry may be able to supply more details; I'm not sure. I indicated yesterday to my honourable friend that this government had already extended the term of the members of the board of directors of the Manitoba Development Fund, so that the composition of the board at the present time remains unchanged; when there is a change it will be announced.

MR. CRAIK: A supplement question. Did the Minister of Industry and Commerce not make the announcement yesterday that the board as of next week, the 1st of April, would be changed?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the terms of office of the present members of the board expire on March 31st. As the First Minister has indicated, these terms have been extended in the past and as of March 31st, however, their terms of office expire and there will be an announcement in due course as to the composition of the next board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is another question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce in connection with the Board. I wonder whether he could indicate since taking office whether he had an occasion to meet with the present members of the Board?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if it's of any interest to my honourable friend, I can say that I did meet some of the members of the Board.

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, my question is asked to the Minister of Industry and Commerce who is replacing the members of the Board, and I would ask whether he on any occasion has met with the present members of the Board, Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's not a proper question I'm quite sure. -- (Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The fact of the matter is that that is a question which the Minister need not answer if he doesn't wish to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. I understand the government is considering to have our Queen read a message from the Throne during a special session of the government this summer in July. I wonder if the arrangements have been finalized, and can the First Minister report if there will be a special session and if the arrangements have been finalized to have our Queen read the message.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to my honourable friend by saying that we don't anticipate any problem, constitutional or otherwise; that the present planning, subject to change, of course, the present planning is to have somewhat the same arrangement as was made for the Royal visit at the Federal Parliament in July, 1967, at which time Her Majesty

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) addressed the joint group of the members of the House of Commons and the Senate in front, outside, in front of the Parliament Buildings. We intend to plan for a similar arrangement here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if he could advise the House if permission will be granted for the mink ranchers of St. Pierre to convert over to a broiler operation as they have requested?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (La du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, the permission cannot be granted from me because I have no jurisdiction over the question whether new producers can enter into the industry. That can only be decided by the Producers Marketing Board which controls the allocation of quotas and so forth; so that the question is better put to the Board. I might point out though that there has been some discussion with the Board and I'm not sure what the answer is at this point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON MCBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, a question - I'm not quite sure who to direct it to but I'll try the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The question is in regard to Mrs. Theresa Kennedy in The Pas who presented a brief before the Landlord and Tenants Committee of this House, and who as a result of that brief received notice to quit or was evicted from her house. I wondered what steps have been taken or if there's any steps this government can take to assist Mrs. Kennedy as she has to move out in a few days and has no place else to live.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, I had some indication that there would be concern in respect to this matter. Of course, if and when a new Landlord and Tenant Act is passed, hopefully, it will provide measures in respect to problems such as this. However, I will take this question as notice and see what steps can be taken if possible, in respect to this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, on the subject of off-shore mineral exploration. Does the Minister anticipate a resumption of this activity in the Hudson Bay this summer?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that the activity will be continuing. In other words, I have no information to the contrary.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. With this possibility in mind, have there been any recent discussions between the governments of Manitoba and Ontario and Quebec and the Federal Government in respect to jurisdiction over the areas of the Bay?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent serious problems which resulted from oil spillage in Chatabuctoo Bay, does the Minister have in mind any safeguards or regulations to minimize the possibility of flow outs should there be a successful hole drilled in the Bay?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the question of jurisdiction and the question as to under whose auspices the drilling will take place is important in this connection. The drilling that is taking place as I now understand it -- I hope I'm not misleading my honourable friend - is under Federal jurisdiction; but needless to say whether it is they or the province, I can only say to my honourable friend that the utmost precautions are being taken with regard to spillage and I'm sure that the incidence that took place in various parts of the world have even called for greater degree of caution because of the accidents that have occurred in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to table the annual report of the Department of Industry and Commerce, including the Manitoba Design Institute, the Manitoba Export Corporation, the Manitoba Research Council and The Manitoba Transportation Commission, for the year ending March 31, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on Monday last the Member for Emerson requested information regarding assessments in unitary divisions. For his information the total increase in

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) unitary divisions in Manitoba was \$82,894,000.00. The question he asked was what is the increase in the Metro area, and the answer to that is \$42,602,520.00.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the honourable member, may I have your permission to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that by leave Bill No. 29, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of same, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, second by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would I be allowed to inquire from the honourable member when this Bill can proceed? There was an indication that it is desirable to have the Bill receive Royal Assent this month, which means it would have to proceed right through all the passages. I had the impression that it was agreed that it would be done today.

MR. FROESE: I never agreed that it would pass right through. We had a discussion yesterday. I'd like to see Hansard, just what was said by the Honourable Minister before I can make further comments.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. FROESE: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, does the honourable member have support for his request for a recorded vote?

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to thank the Honourable House Leader for reminding me. Does the honourable member have support? Call in the members.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): . . . whether or not this procedure is in order. The Minister of Finance proceeded by leave of the House to present the bill. Later in the debate the Honourable Member for Rhineland has declined to give leave to proceed any further, and I wonder if this is necessary.

MR. GREEN: . . . an objection, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Leave was given. The Honourable Member for Rhineland didn't ask for leave, he moved that debate be adjourned and a vote was taken and the motion was voted down. That is different.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, had I known that they would not be allowing me to adjourn the debate, I wouldn't have given leave.

MR. SPEAKER: For the information of the members who may not have been in the Chamber at this time, on a motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Bill No. 29 be now read a second time; there's a motion before the House, moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that debate be adjourned. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt and Weir.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Boyce, Borowski, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. -- (Interjection) -- question on the main motion.

MR. GREEN: . . . the honourable member would still have the floor if he wishes to speak. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, having been denied the right to adjourn debate so that I

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) would have been able to scrutinize Hansard and as to what was said yesterday, the statistics that were given, I will have to do as best I can under the circumstances.

I think this is a shameful event that we have to witness here this morning. Five minutes ago the bills were distributed, none of the members have scrutinized the bill or gone through it as to what it contains, and here we're supposed to pass it today. I think this is absurd. Certainly I haven't seen the likeness of this until this date. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance is one that is very arrogant. I know this to be the case because on other occasions I have had experiences of this type. He would pass out information to the leaders of the other parties because there were larger numbers to their parties, but as far as our group, myself, and I don't know about the Member for Churchill, we're nonentities, we're not supposed to know things. We don't seem to represent people back home and we are not supposed to have the same say that other members of this House have. I dislike this very much and I resent it.

Yesterday I questioned the Minister on the various items of the schedule that was discussed, and they're asking for a very large amount under Capital Supply. This is in addition to the estimates which are a record of this province. The estimates total 448 million. This is close to 75 million more than the previous government brought in and I feel this is a matter of concern; this is a matter of concern to the people of this province. And in addition to that, now ask for the large amount under Capital Supply, and we are told that this is not the final amount that will be asked for; there will be additional amounts coming in at a later date. So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to know what was said and being able to analyze the information in a better way, this is why I asked for adjournment of the Bill so that I could give it proper study. However, that being denied, I cannot do so at the present time.

Then I feel that the whole thing is worked in reverse. Here we are supposed to okay 129 million dollars worth of supply, and yet we haven't discussed any of the estimates of the departments. We don't know whether the money in those departments is going for the proper things that we would like to see it go for. If that was done first, we would have a better idea whether the Capital Supply that they're asking for works in with it or whether it should be cut down and which items should be cut down. There might even be areas where we feel that more money should be spent and that there should be a revision in the amounts that are being asked for. But no, we are not supposed to be in an intelligent position here, or a position where we can discuss this matter intelligently; and I certainly protest with all the power I have to this way of dealing with the Capital Supply before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, after this exercise in open government that we've just been through, I hadn't really anticipated in taking part in the debate. I was quite prepared to see the legislation proceed and proceed today. I think that it was reasonable to expect, really, that this might be the case; but I also say, Mr. Speaker, that it wasn't necessary, the end of the month isn't until Tuesday, the end of the month isn't until Tuesday. I understand the difficulties the government have had because under the rules they can't bring in the Estimates until the Throne Speech is completed, and the end of the month is fairly close from the conclusion of the Throne Speech and they did have a problem in getting everything in. But the fact of the matter is that with reasonable co-operation, our friend from Rhineland could have been given until Monday, without closure, without a refusal of debate, without a refusal to debate. I think that we should have been able to go through it and I regret it. But every member of this House has a right for time to consider the authorization of \$130 million, if a member of this House feels that he needs that time, and that it isn't putting the government over a barrel -- and it wouldn't have been putting the government over a barrel. There was time, Mr. Speaker, there was time - Monday is the 30th, Tuesday is the 31st. Mr. Speaker, in my view, we have seen the unnecessary use of closure, the unnecessary use of closure, -- (Interjection) -- it did happen -- (Interjection) -- it did happen, he asked for time, he asked for time, and really what happened was the government said if you want to say it, say it today.

MR. FOX: That's right.

MR. WEIR: Anything you want to say, say it today. Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a standing and a recorded vote. We had a standing and a recorded vote. It was after a comment by the Minister of Finance who indicated that they really couldn't stand an adjournment. The fact of the matter is they could have stood an adjournment. The fact of the matter is that Monday would have been soon enough. The fact of the matter is I think that co-operation from our

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) friend from Rhineland would have been possible by Monday.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the exercise we've just been through is one that is going to make it more difficult, more difficult to achieve leave by all members of the House, recognition of the fact that it only takes one member to stop things progressing in a normal fashion. Mr. Speaker, may I say I'd have thought they'd have eaten a little crow instead of being so - arrogant was the word that the Member for Rhineland used. The Member for Elmwood is showing equal arrogance, if not more so, because they have had it pointed out to them, and I think relatively mildly, that it would have been possible to have met therein, to have met therein, and met the request of the Member for Rhineland at the same time.

Had today been the end of the month, I would have appealed myself to the Member for Rhineland to co-operate and to carry the thing through. Had today been the end of the month, I don't think that closure would have been required, I think everything would have been fine and dandy. But, Mr. Speaker, a government that has prided themselves in being open, the thing that it has proven to me is that it's open when they want to talk, it's not so open when somebody on this side wants to express himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Member for Rhineland . . .

-- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak at this time, but I feel that we in this Party should also register our protest over the way matters have proceeded today. I am sympathetic with my friend, the Minister of Finance, and the bind that he finds himself in, and we would like to co-operate; but we must recall how this bind came about. Had the session began a month or two earlier, this would never have happened. There would have been time for debate. There wouldn't have been a deadline of May 31st for money. -- (Interjection) -- Oh now come now, come now, you knew, you knew the rules of responsibility for government. You must accept them, you must accept them. So the session started later for reasons of the government -- (Interjection) -- reasons of the government, it's within your power to call the session when you feel you should. So in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I quote again, I quoted this before, but this is in the Throne Speech: "My Ministers believe that at this time in our history we need to abandon old ideas, dogmas and traditions that have outlived their relevance and usefulness." I don't know whether that's an open door to do exactly what they want whenever they feel they have to do something, I don't think it is, and I don't think it should be ever done again in this House - what we have seen today. I know that the government bungled into it, but they should at least have the decency to apologize for the actions that have taken place this morning.

Like the Leader of the Opposition has said, there's going to be some members think twice before they give leave to proceed again when something isn't on the Order Paper. But after having said that, I say that we do want to co-operate, but we're not going to be bullied around; and we're not going to be told that now, you do it now and you do it in our terms. We are not going to co-operate with that sort of stuff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, if there ever was an indication of how this government intends to proceed with the administration of government in this country or in this province, we have it today. Arbitrary, arrogant, without consideration for the feelings of others, without consideration of the rights of people on this side of the House. The Minister of Agriculture brought up the old herring about it was "our fault". How long, Mr. Speaker, how long are they going to continue to try and saddle this Party with their mistakes? -- (Interjection) -- They have the responsibility today, Mr. Speaker, they have the responsibility to call this Legislature into Session, to put forth the business of this Legislature, and they and they alone have that responsibility. On this side of the House we have the right as members to examine whatever legislation they put forth, whatever spending programs that they have, and we have the right to examine them in detail. All my honourable friend from Rhineland asked for was the opportunity of that examination. This has been denied. This has been denied because they want their way and the people of this province now have a clear indication of the type of government that they're going to get; of the type of arrogance, in government, that's going to flow forth from that side of the House. And I hope that when business is brought before this House in the future, there is going to be ample opportunity, ample opportunity for

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) the members of this side of the House to examine it, without the imposition of closure. As a matter of fact, not only did they want to deny the Honourable Member from Rhineland the opportunity of speaking in this debate, the House Leader, who has certainly led the way in arrogance in this Chamber, wanted to deny him the right to a recorded vote. And if this isn't the height of arrogance, I don't know what is. We've had three or four examples of how the House Leader intends to impose his will on this House; how the House Leader intends to push his and bull his way without regard of the rights of the members of this Chamber.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. Is the honourable member suggesting that I made at any point, did I at any time say, that the honourable member is not entitled to a recorded vote? The rules require three . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. I do not believe that the difference of interpretation as to allegation of fact is a point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well I simply conclude my remarks by repeating, Mr. Speaker, that on this side of the House in the future, the honourable members better be sure that they have a good case if they expect to get the kind of co-operation that they want; and in this Chamber, co-operation is necessary to get the business of the House through. They have clearly indicated that they don't intend to co-operate with the members of this side of the House. That they are going to have their way, no matter what. And if that's the kind of attitude that they want prevailing in this Chamber, they will suffer the consequences.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, firstly, just a comment on the question of a recorded vote. It seems to me very clear that the rules require that there shall be support for a request for a recorded vote; it seems to me it was in order to find out if there was that support, and it was discovered and there was a recorded vote. I want to say at this stage that in my opinion the opposition in this government and the opposition to the former government were co-operative to a very large measure in carrying through business of the House that was urgent, and certainly, I don't feel that there has been lack of co-operation on our part of the Official Opposition in previous years, nor do I feel there has been lack of co-operation since this government has taken power.

Now, as was pointed out by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, this matter was brought into the Legislature as quickly as could be in accordance with tradition and requirements. And before it was brought in formally, copies of the Capital Supply Bill were given to both the Leader of the official Opposition and to the Leader of the Liberal Party - that was the morning before the evening in which they were brought in - and indication was made as to what the procedure was to be. And again there was a change in the procedure due to the discussions we have had. Now I did not discuss it in any particular with the Member for Rhineland, but he did receive the copy that was given to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party and was aware of it. Now yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I explained the procedure that I expected would take place in accordance with a note that I was given as to how it should follow through; and there are words that say that hopefully, second and third reading could be proceeded with today. Now, there is no indication to me, that there would be any objection with our proceeding with this second reading of the Bill. No indication at all. The only indication I received was a positive one.

MR. FROESE: . . . no objection to have second reading.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, I understand it, but I also did explain yesterday, that I would hope - I use the word "hope" - that we could go through with second reading committee stage, third reading today, and that would have set things up right now. It was suggested that an apology is in order. I don't apologize, I'm sorry, of course, that it happened that way. But I made a rapid calculation -- and I now want to point out to the honourable member that with all his years of experience in this House, and that applies to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as well, that there is still opportunity and will be, for the honourable member to debate at length -- and the rapid calculation I made, was that assuming second reading passes today, which I think it will, then we still have to go into committee stage. And to go into committee stage, requires leave. I realize that there was a likelihood that I would not get leave to go into committee which means it would stand over to Monday, and then we all know that in committee, every honourable member will have every opportunity to explore fully

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) all those facets that interest him. That fact is, that I am - I am anxious, I stated it yesterday, that this matter should be disposed of by Tuesday. Now I don't know offhand whether I require leave for third reading, I assume not, because it's not on the slip given to me. But it would have been conceivable that by lack of the co-operation that we've had up to now, that we could be taken beyond that date, and - well we'd have to bear whatever consequences there are to bear. But I don't feel that the honourable member has been put in a position where he cannot debate this - and with intelligent information based on reading of Hansard. We would still have to go to committee stage, and I'm assuming now that he will not grant leave to go into committee today, which means that on Monday we would go into committee, at which time we know he can speak more than once. We also know that on third reading he could speak. So really I didn't feel that there was any denial to him of the opportunity to speak; but if we had to have a series of delays, then I felt that this was going beyond the expeditious handling of this Bill. If members disagree with my reasoning, I can only say again I'm sorry they disagree, but it seemed to me that we were not denying him that right and I really don't think we were. Now may I say also -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. WEIR: Just do it our way.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition says, "do it our way". I remember that in the past when we were sitting on that side we were consulted by the House Leader from time to time of the former government - and I think that there was co-operation then - and to the extent that there has been consultation in this short period of time I think it has been done by understanding, and in the last session I feel that there was co-operation on both sides. When the honourable member now says, "just do it our way", I really don't think he is being fair but he has the right to do it that way, and as has just been pointed out to me, one of the points that he objected to when I discussed with him the procedure was a certain item which I then told him that I would delete and postpone so that there wouldn't be the problem. And I still had the understanding -- I still have the understanding that all the members of the House, other than the Member for Rhineland, were prepared and are prepared to proceed with this now, and since the Member for Rhineland felt that he needed time I knew that he would have time both in committee and on Third Reading, and assuming that he wanted to delay it, I knew that I could not expect leave from him to go into Committee of Supply. Now he may not like my reasoning, but I have given you my reasoning and it's an honest interpretation of what I feel is the method by which the rights of the Honourable Member for Rhineland would be protected.

Now may I say, Mr. Speaker, it was my intention after this passed to bring in the Interim Supply Bill, and then after it passed second reading to ask, by leave, that the two bills be referred to Committee of the Whole for consideration. Now in view of the fact that it may be that leave, and I don't expect that leave will be granted to go to Committee of the Whole for this bill with which I am dealing . . .

MR. FROESE: I'm quite happy to give leave to the other bill but this one certainly didn't have the urgency that the other one has. I'm quite willing to proceed with the other bill, go right through all the stages for that matter to give the government the necessary money so they can operate, but Capital Supply didn't have the urgency at all.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what was said by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, which shortens what I was going to say. Instead of presenting the motion that I would have been prepared to present this morning after the passing of the two bills on second reading, I was going to - at least it was all ready for me to move by leave that we go into Committee of the Whole to consider both bills. I now intend to separate the motion and I will present each motion separately so the honourable member could deny leave to go through the committee stage on this bill and that will give him time until Monday, and then I will bring in a separate motion, by leave, that we proceed with Interim Supply and hopefully that will go through and we can take Interim Supply through. I have now explained my reasoning. I recognize that the Honourable Member for Rhineland will have every opportunity to proceed with his discussion on this current bill, but again because of the timing and the leave requirement I would ask that the second reading of this bill be passed today and then when I ask for leave I am assuming it will be denied and then we can proceed with it Monday. I am looking towards the Clerk to see whether there would be any obstacle to proceeding Monday with the committee, and I have an indication that that would be in order. So as a matter of fact, possibly I won't even present the motion to go into committee on this bill today, I'll just leave it and then I will

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) not require leave for Monday, so that will ensure the rights of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

I did have information which I had proposed to give to the House at committee stage, but since we won't arrive to the committee stage on this bill — information was requested by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose so possibly I should put it on the record now and again it will be available for Monday. The question asked — and it's the only question I believe that was asked in the debate which was not answered. Now if I'm wrong I want to be corrected because I am under the impression — I checked with officials of the department — and I think all questions that were asked were answered yesterday with the exception of the outstanding capital authorizations unused to date, that's the complete list, and I have just received it and I will put it on record so that it will be available for Monday's debate. And I'll have to make some explanatory notes.

The first and the most important explanatory note is that the department was able to produce this list as at February 28, 1970, and the department says that there have been transactions which have taken place during March which are still in process and are not yet finalized, and of course members will recognize the books of the province are not closed for the month of March and it is just not possible to give actual or accurate figures at this time. Normally books are closed some time in the following month for the preceding month, so that when I give the figures as of February 28th, 1970, there will be reductions in some of these items.

The first item is the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board which has unauthorized — now I'm giving all the figures that are outstanding capital authorizations unused — and that figure is \$210,793,075.81. When I saw that figure I immediately went back to my notes of yesterday where I had given an indication of 60 to 70 million dollars of unused authority for Hydro and I thought there was a substantial discrepancy in amounts, but the statement that was given to me as to the 60 to 70 million was the amount that was expected to be used by Hydro in this coming year, and I myself thought glancing at it that that was the authorized unused, but the authorized unused is what I have just given, 210 and some millions, and the figure I gave yesterday, 60 to 70 million, is the amount which Hydro expects will be required to be borrowed in this coming fiscal year. So that's one explanatory comment.

Now Manitoba Hydro re studies relative to production of electrical energy on Nelson River — \$500,000; Manitoba Telephone System — I gave that figure — \$18,340,138.68; Manitoba Water Supply Board — \$594,500, which is somewhat more than the figure I gave yesterday of \$519,500. I am informed the difference is the estimate of the amount which will be expended during this current month and the two figures would be reconciled once the current month's authorization was used and is known of. It's in process now. The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation — I gave that figure — \$3,300,000; Manitoba Development Fund — \$10,000,000, and I'm informed that that \$10,000,000 is in process and is about nil right now, which confirms what I stated yesterday; Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation — I gave that figure — \$14,300,000; Manitoba School Capital Financing Authority — \$9,869,000, and again I'm informed that that amount is in process and is expected to be nil by the end of this month. That's really the reason why we are trying to get this bill through this month. Advances under the Municipal Works Assistance Act — \$1,264,283.07; Highways, Roads and Related Projects, Structures and Facilities — \$4,050,000; Red River Valley, Assiniboine River, Seine River and Lake Manitoba Flood Protection, Soil Erosion, Water Control and Drainage Projects — \$2,550,000; Provincial Buildings, Land, Construction, Alterations, Renovations, Furnishings and Grounds Improvements — \$1,000,000; University of Manitoba — \$2,000,000; Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation — \$3,000,000, which I understand will be expended by the end of this month; Community Seed Cleaning Plants — \$68,000; and General Purposes, which I understand is mainly Highways — \$4,800,000; for a total of \$286,428,997.56. That, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. FROESE: . . . are correct, the Hydro Board alone was \$210,000,000.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, I gave a figure of a total of \$286 million. All I can say is it's more than \$210 million and I'm assuming that the addition is correct, but it probably is. I think that completes the comments that I would make on second reading. I have already indicated that I was prepared to ask leave to go into committee on this bill but I won't do that. I will bring it in on Monday, since in any event the honourable member could and by all means should hold it until Monday.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be kind enough to give us

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) sheets with that information, otherwise we would have to wait until Monday afternoon until we get Hansard.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll do my best to have it in the hands -- do all honourable members want it? -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well I can pass it around some time today.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 21, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I only say this is the Interim Supply Bill. If this doesn't pass this month then not only civil servants won't be paid but Social Allowances won't be paid and all the other necessary on-going business of the government will not be paid.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources that, by leave, Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 21, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 21, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971. Section 1--passed; Section 2 -- The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, on Section 2, I am sure there is a perfectly logical explanation but I would appreciate the explanation from the Minister. My mathematics don't reveal to me that the sum we are voting in Interim Supply, being \$173,845,880, works out to 40 percent of the total amount that we are ultimately being asked to vote in the main Estimates which is \$448,043,500. If the sum we are voting today were 40 percent of the total sum in the Estimates, then the total figure would be 434 million rather than 448 million. I wonder if the Minister would explain that discrepancy.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister rises to answer, hasn't it been the practice to just ask for 10 or 20 percent in past years? Why do we go to 40 percent? What is the reason behind it? Why do we need that much money to carry on for that length and period of time? The House will be in session.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize to the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I was trying to follow what he was saying and also what I was being told by the Clerk, and I didn't quite grasp what he said. Was it a question directed to me?

MR. FROESE: Yes. Why ask for 40 percent when it has been the practice to ask for 10 or 20 percent? It seems rather a large percentage for Interim Supply. Is there any special reason why you are asking for 40 percent?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with both. Firstly, the figures given by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he said 40 percent of 440--some million dollars is -- what amount?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I worked it out the other way. All I am saying is that . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I understand now; that's where the confusion took place. The real explanation -- of course I have to give the real one -- is that there are statutory amounts in the Interim Supply such as legislative indemnities, such as interest on capital borrowing which do not have to be voted, which are never voted on. They are in the Estimates but they are not voted on because they are statutory, and I gather that this amount which is represented to be 40 percent is of those items which have to be voted and that therefore it is less than the full 40 percent on the full amount. That's, as I said, the real explanation, but I wanted to go on to say that if there's a mistake in the calculation, well we'll have to manage with 38 percent if indeed that's all it amounts to.

Now the answer to the Honourable Member for Rhineland is of course the fact that we

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) are starting later than usual and we have an extensive legislative program and it may well be that because of centennial celebrations or because of the will of this House we will continue beyond the normal time. Now I hope we won't, but in case we do, the department was anxious that there be sufficient monies to tide over such necessity and therefore the department has requested that it be a 40 percent figure. The usual figure I believe was 20 percent in the past and that's the reason for 40 percent now, but I assure you we can't operate for the full year on the amount being requested at this time and that's the explanation for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 29 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 21, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Bill No. 21, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1971 be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the second reading of government bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 8. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister, could we have leave to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed). Would that apply to Bill No. 9?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed). Bill No. 14. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Credit Unions Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, members opposite may wonder why we are introducing a minor amendment to the current Credit Unions Act. I want to point out that you will recall last year there was a great deal of concern about permitting credit unions to increase their rate of interest on shares and to - in other words to bump them up or remove the ceiling. The new Act will provide no ceiling at all. This particular amendment will bump the rate up to 10 percent. The reason for that is that to do it any other way we would have to simply redraft many sections or whole sections of the present Act, and by simply allowing a bump up to the 10 percent level we simply have to change one or two words and it really amounts to the same thing. The new Act hopefully will be passed later on in this session which would render this particular amendment be done in any case, but for the time being, to enable the credit unions to up their interest rate we are introducing an early amendment to the current legislation. There's only one point that may concern people and that is the retroactive clause, although I would suggest that if there are any questions in that area that we deal with those during the Law Amendments if there are some reservations on that part.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the government for bringing this bill in at this particular time, and also to providing for the retroactive clause. I am fully in accord with it and I'm sure that credit unions already are availing themselves of this provision. Certainly it has helped many of the unions in the province and it certainly will help them to compete financially with the various other institutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I too would simply want to record the pleasure of our group on this side to see the Minister bringing in this legislation that will

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) enable the credit union movement to strengthen and to be in a more competitive situation with respect to shareholder investments. We note with pleasure that the Minister would seem to indicate that there would be further measures, bill presented, or a whole new Act indeed presented with regard to the Credit Union movement, and we would look forward to it at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to join the others in agreeing that it was I think high time that it was coming in and I'm glad that this time has been chosen to present this bill. I'm happy to hear that the whole bill, the whole Act will be revised as far as credit unions are concerned. I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister just said, it bumped from six to ten. Has the figure ten any magic number or just another number?

MR. USKIW: I believe this is a figure that the people in the industry are prepared to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

MR. BARKMAN: That's fine.

MR. USKIW: I believe that's the figure that the industry is prepared to live with in the interim until the new Act comes in, which completely eliminates a figure; it will be wide open under the new legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CRAIK: . . . you weren't closing debate?

MR. GREEN: If the honourable member wishes to ask a question, he'll certainly have to . . .

MR. CRAIK: . . . the interest rate applies to the interest that they're allowed to charge on the loans. I was wondering if there is a ceiling also on the interest rates returned on shares.

MR. USKIW: The same interest rate applies. The memo I have here is that this also means that the rate of interest on deposits can be increased to 10 percent.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first department for consideration is the Department of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Chairman, in presenting the estimates for the Department of Labour for the next ensuing year, I would like to first of all take the opportunity of expressing the appreciation of the department and the government to all of the workers in the Province of Manitoba. It is our considered opinion that the contribution made by the labouring force in Manitoba is well worthy of recognition and that we should be thankful for the contribution that is made by labour to the economy of Manitoba. And in saying this, Mr. Chairman, I'm not unmindful of the contribution that is made by management as well, and I feel that there is a considerable degree of co-operation existing between management and labour in Manitoba today, and I am pleased, as the Minister of Labour, to associate the government with these groups because government itself has a large role to play in the associations existing between management and labour.

I'd also like to pay a tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the staff of the Department of Labour, to my Deputy Minister, and to all of the officials of the department I want to say "thank you". These men and women, Mr. Chairman, very often work beyond the normal call of duty, and while there are times that criticisms are levelled at the members of the departments in the Department of Labour, the sections in the Department of Labour, I think that it is only proper to recognize the work that is being done, and of course we are prepared to accept criticisms where, in the opinion of labour or management or the members of this House, where they feel that there is room for improvement, and I say that there is room for

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) improvement at all times and that is the desire of the department.

I would make a brief reference, Mr. Chairman, to one who had served Manitoba well for a considerable period of time and recently passed to his just reward. I would pay tribute to the late Dean Tallin who served as Chairman of the Manitoba Labour Board for many years and made a contribution thereby. His place at the present time is being filled by the Vice-Chairman of the Labour Board, Mr. A. Montague Israels, who has had a long association in the field of labour and management relations.

Also, I think that it would only be proper for me on the introduction of the estimates of the Department of Labour to thank Mr. W. Elliott Wilson who served many years with distinction as the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Mr. Willion Johnston, Q. C. has been appointed Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board to succeed Mr. Wilson, and many members will recall the fact that Mr. Johnston served as Chairman of the Municipal Board of Manitoba and also served as the Deputy Attorney-General.

So I say at the commencement of the consideration of the estimates of the Department of Labour, these remarks I suggest are not out of place.

It is now my pleasure to introduce the estimates of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year 1970-71. The estimates of course provide measures of the cost of the department's program to be carried out in the year ahead and for which now we seek the approval of the committee. I think it would be of help in our consideration of the estimates if I begin by briefly describing the objectives underlying the program of the department; then I would like to review recent developments in relation to my department's interest and responsibility. The objectives underlying the legislation and programs administered by the Department of Labour are five-fold.

(a) To develop and maintain effective relations between employers and employees in the province, particularly where the parties are organized and have the responsibility, principally through collective bargaining, of creating and regulating the terms and conditions of their employment relationship.

Secondly, to establish and enforce meaningful minimum standards of labour in the fields of minimum wages, hours of work, paid vacations and other working conditions. Our concern here is primarily with employees who do not have effective means of competing in the labour field market so that they may secure satisfactory wages and employment conditions.

Thirdly, to establish requirements and carry out programs to provide minimum safety for all of the employees, employers and the general public concerning fire prevention, the operation of mechanical, electrical and other types of equipment.

Fourthly, to develop and carry out apprenticeship and certain industrial training courses to equip persons with the required skills and knowledge in a number of occupations.

And fifth and lastly, to carry out programs aimed at protecting human rights.

Basically, these objectives have been accepted by us all for some time, and legislation and programs have come into existence to give them effect. I consider that it is our essential task, however, to continuously improve our legislation and programs in the light of changing conditions and needs so that these objectives will continue to be met, and, where necessary and possible, better meet the situation. As good as these programs may seem and sound when stated, the objectives will lack real meaning unless we change our legislation and programs in the light of changing requirements for improvement. Taking this approach, I would like to review the year immediately past from the viewpoint of the department's interest and programs. I believe that this will show us where progress is being made; how effective our programs have been; and what are our major concerns and in what areas we propose to make changes.

During 1969 there were further substantial increases in average wages and salaries in the province and our unemployment rate was lower than that of the previous year. Average wages advanced at the national rate by approximately 7.2 percent, and our unemployment rate was 2.7 percent down from 3.5 percent the previous year and below the national average of 4.7 percent. Consumer price index continued to increase rapidly, though at a slightly less rapid rate than the national average of the previous year. The labour force in Manitoba for 1969 averaging 373,000 was slightly higher than in 1968 when our average work force was 372,000. The employed labour force in 1969 averaged 363,000 and showed a somewhat higher increase over 1968 of 360,000. So the picture of our employment, wage and price performance

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) in 1969 and at the moment, is very mixed, reflecting the uncertainty about economic conditions prevailing across the country and in fact across the continent as a whole.

Manitoba's wage growth and low rate of unemployment in 1969 was relatively good. But we are concerned about other developments, particularly the impact of anti-inflation policies which are now associated with rising unemployment and the lack of employment demand in the country as a whole.

Honourable members will, I am sure, have observed over the recent days the presentation of a brief by the Canadian Labour Congress to the Government of Canada in respect to price control and wage control. And in the brief of the Labour Congress, I think they properly pointed out to the government that the approach being taken at the present time could be criticized because of the effect on the amount of employment in Canada. And their observation was that if unemployment is created for the purpose as an anti-inflation measure, it could result in additional hardships to many who would be more properly and gainfully making a contribution if we had increased employment rather than increased unemployment as a result of governmental directive.

Collective bargaining increased in the province during 1969 and labour-management relations continued to be excellent. The number of negotiations for new collective agreements were up, and our conciliation officers were appointed to an increased number of cases. Despite this, there were fewer work stoppages and less time lost as a result of disputes compared with 1968. And again I pay tribute to the conciliation officers of the Department of Labour for their services to industry and to labour. The province therefore continued to have the best record of work stoppages in the country, and our incidence of time lost was approximately one percent of the figure for the country as a whole.

I think that labour and management in Manitoba are to be congratulated for this record of industrial relations. I believe, as well, this record reflects the effectiveness of legislation concerning collective bargaining and conciliation, and the competence of the personnel concerned in collective bargaining - management, labour and the services of the Department of Labour alike, and if during my tenure in office as the Minister of Labour we can even extend the harmonious relationships between management and labour I feel that we will accomplish much. I think that it is an on-going crusade that we should all be taking part in to bring about a continued understanding and expansion of a better understanding between labour and management, so that when the day arrives for collective bargaining process to take place and the representatives of management and labour meet around a table to consider wages and working conditions, that they know each other before they start. I feel quite frequently some of the causes of work stoppages have been that the bargaining personnel on both sides really don't appreciate or know each other until they meet face to face, and it is my hope that we will be able to induce and cause the establishment of continuing employee-management committees that will meet throughout the year to consider how better the two components can work together in the interests, not only of themselves but of the general public as well.

In the fall of 1969 a number of changes were introduced amending our labour legislation and regulations. We intend to introduce further measures as indicated in the Speech from the Throne. Manitoba's minimum wage was increased from \$1.25 to \$1.35 an hour effective on December 1st of 1969, making it the highest in Canada at that time. The minimum wage is now under active consideration with a view to consider whether or not improvements will be made.

An extensive number of changes were made in the fall to the Workmen's Compensation Act providing for significant increases and benefits to injured workers and their dependents, and for improvements in administration of the Act. You will find reference to this in the report of the Board.

Amendments were made to the Labour Board Rules of Procedure and to the Vacations with Pay Act in line with recommendations made by the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee referred to also in the Annual Report.

The Woods Committee recently completed a review of its past work and submitted a number of recommendations about its future role and work. Members have received copies of the committee's report on these matters and know that the government concurs in the matters reported in that report. The Committee has recommended that it continue its review of labour legislation on an independent basis, and I want to emphasize on the "independent basis",

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) because it will not be the attitude of this administration to await decisions emanating from the Woods Committee before we take legislative action in any field we feel that action should be taken. The committee has proposed to undertake examination of a number of other matters concerning industrial relations in the province. There's a big job to be done and it is recognized fully by the committee and by the government.

A special event which took place in the fall of 1969 was the national Tripartite Conference held by the Canadian Government to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the International Labour Organization. Representatives of labour, management and government met for three days in Ottawa in the same fashion as they do at the conventions of the International Labour Organization in Geneva. Officials of the Department of Labour assisted in the preparation for the conference and participated fully in the proceedings.

Early in 1969, in September, my officials and I attended a Provincial-Federal meeting in Ottawa to consider the recently published report of the Federal Task Force on labour relations. The report contains a great number of recommendations which are of interest to provincial governments as well as the federal. The report is an important addition to our review of labour legislation and industrial relations in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, in proposing the adoption of the estimates of the Department of Labour, I do so with pleasure, but with a reservation that the provision of the required monies will not go all the way that we would desire in making full provision in relationships between management and labour and the community as a whole. We do feel - we do feel, however, that we will, with the adoption of the estimates, be able to improve and increase the contribution of the Department of Labour to all of the citizens of Manitoba, and I recommend their adoption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to have you back in the Chair, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to peaceful deliberations of the estimates. I am particularly pleased to respond on the part of our group to the Honourable the Minister of Labour this morning. He may question with a smile why I was so selected, but being a man of many talents, I'm sure you don't question that, Mr. Chairman. I should also state perhaps my sole or few humble credits to be discussing labour as a one time active member of the United Steel Workers of America, that I've had some conciliation with the labour, the union work, and also from the management aspects of it in my other years of life.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment out - and really the thought occurred to me when I opened up the report from the Department of Labour, the Annual Report that was presented to us the other day, and I note on the first page the Honourable Minister of Labour's photograph, and the thought did occur to me that perhaps a minute or two of reflection, or a minute or two of recognition is perhaps due this particular Minister of Labour. I don't find it difficult, Mr. Chairman, from this side of the House to pass a comment on the career and work of the Honourable the Minister of Labour whose long years of service in the union movements, whose long years of service in the municipal field, the public field here in this Legislature culminating with the position that he now holds as Minister of Labour, must to himself personally be a very satisfying one, and I can understand it and appreciate it and wish to transmit that to him officially and have it in the record. The only disappointment perhaps in his otherwise successful life was perhaps to have had the occasion to sit one chair over the time that he was leading the party that is now in power, but this was not to be in the cards and I'm sure that suffering that disappointment he nonetheless has a tremendous satisfaction of being the Minister of Labour for the Province of Manitoba.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, and we are dealing on the Minister's salary, let me go on to say another word, that I do not take any exception to Item No. 1, namely, \$15,600 for the Minister's salary. I honestly believe that in particular this Minister is worth every cent of it, and indeed all Minister's on that side are worth every cent of it, but I say it again with no tongue in cheek even though my honourable colleague I recall at one time introduced a motion to reduce this Minister's salary down to 98 cents. But I think the year of responsibility that the front benchers have now under their belt, certainly hardly needs anybody from this side telling them that there is a job to be done and the job is onerous, the responsibilities are heavy, and that while we disagree with how the job is being carried out, nobody in his right mind that has any understanding of the workings of this Chamber or the workings of government can seriously question the fact that we are in it for the money or we're lining our pockets while

(MR. ENNS cont'd) we are here.

But I for one, if we're talking about doing away with some of the traditions, dogmas and things, the traditional manner of showing ill-pleasure or dissatisfaction with a performance of a government by reducing or causing a motion to come in to reduce the minister's salary to \$1.00 is one, Mr. Chairman, that I think has passed its usefulness and is not understood outside this Chamber. We understand it here when such a motion is passed. My wife didn't quite understand it sometimes, but we understand it here, that it's a traditional form of expressing displeasure with either the minister's performance or the department's performance or indeed the government's performance, but I think it's the kind of thing that is subject to misunderstanding by the public now in 1970 and for that reason, and it's a reason that I would hope my colleagues and other members in the opposition would want to consider, whether or not the rather traditional motion of reducing Ministers' salaries to \$1.00 isn't in fact passé and we should find other ways, and I rather suspect that we will find other ways, of indicating to the front bench, to the government, how displeased we are from time to time with some of their performance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour is not one of the larger departments in terms of demands on the public treasury. The labour estimates before us are pretty straightforward. I think that the Minister himself would now recognize that in the 23 bills that he has to administer in his department that contrary to the opinion sometimes expressed by himself or by his party when they were on the opposition side of the benches, that labour legislation has in fact moved forward at a reasonably steady and orderly pace, even under the past administration, and that I certainly concur with his hopes and his remarks that the resultant harmonious relationship that exists between management and labour today in the Manitoba scene would continue under his stewardship.

I think also, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the fact that we have been amply forewarned by not only the Throne Speech but by also numerous articles in the press, this government has let it be known that they telegraph a lot of their punches through the press on future legislation, so that we are well warned of probably fairly significant, fairly important legislation on its way dealing with many aspects that we would like to debate in a positive and a progressive manner, and that perhaps it will be understandable, or it should be understandable on the part of all that the major portion of debate with respect to the Department of Labour would come at that time when bills that effect major changes in our labour legislation as we now have it in the Province of Manitoba, that it would be at that time, Mr. Chairman, that we will be taking up the time of the House at greater length to debate the issues that are contained, debate the principles that are contained within the bills as we see them.

I have a few particular things that I would like to hear from the Minister. I recall as a former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that I was really never too happy with some of the labour-oriented Acts that we had to administer under that department. I'm not aware, Mr. Chairman, that if in fact some action in this respect has been taken; if it hasn't I recommend it to the Minister. I'm referring specifically to some of the labour inspection, safety inspection, mines inspecting Acts which I consider to be more of a labour-oriented type of legislation that could well be brought under the purview of the Minister of Labour and out of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. There appears to be, at least it was apparent to me very quickly in the department that there was indeed some degree of conflict of interests. The Department of Mines and Natural Resources is there to stimulate and promote the development of certain resources, and at the same time to be of a law enforcing type of an agency made it sometimes difficult. So I would ask the Minister to indicate to the House whether or not any specific action is being contemplated in taking those specific features, I believe it's out of the Mines Act, into the Department of Labour where I believe it should in fact be. I might indicate to the Minister that had my short tenure in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources not been so fully preoccupied by another matter of some substance that perhaps this would have been done prior to this time.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome the suggestions or the views of the Minister that he will continue with the Woods Committee, its deliberations. We reserve, of course, our position in terms of the announcement that he made this morning - in fact it's not the announcement, the policy that we know this government to follow, that they do not necessarily feel themselves bound or restricted by any of the actions of these committees or in activity of these committees, that they indeed intend to proceed with legislation at their pace -- and I can't really fault it because I honestly believe that the hands of responsibility, the government makes these

(MR. ENNS cont'd) decisions and they have to take the responsibility for when and how they are made.

I would like to express, you know, some reservation in the area, that again, Mr. Chairman, that I have some concern for the manner and the way the committees can be used by a government that perhaps would like to use them for some purposes and not use them for other purposes. In other words, that would like to have the facilities of the Minimum Wage Board to act as a convenient place for discussion to take place and when at other times it becomes convenient for the government to take an action that they believe to be right or popular they then make very sure that they do it and do it on their own credits or on their own merit.

In the question of minimum wages it's a far greater question than simply one of attempting to establish or, I have the feeling that we're moving from, you know, the concept of a minimum wage to the concept of a fair wage. Well, that's another concept if we want to talk about it in that light. I would think that there's a tremendous degree of responsibility on the Minister to be particularly cognizant of the fact that we have tremendous variations in this province. There is the constant danger of being totally influenced by, or concern by the large urban problems that we face here, but I make a plea to the Minister to keep very much in his mind some of the unique problems that smaller areas, school areas, smaller businesses, rural businesses, individual farms or farmers who in many instances operate on the kind of a labour-management relationship which is really quite lost or quite misunderstood in the urban setting where you have sophisticated management or sophisticated union approach to solving the labour problems that may arise. There are many, many instances where in the smaller aspects, particularly in rural Manitoba, you enter into the kind of relationship with the employer and employee which is unknown or unheard of in the city, where many additional benefits are automatically included into one's contract of employment for instance; that unless carefully looked into really do in fact constitute a fairly major portion of the remuneration that perhaps that employee received, although it's not always that apparent on the surface.

So I make that general suggestion to the Minister of Labour that while he is no doubt primarily concerned with the position of the major labour force in the province, the major labour force being located in our larger urban centres, this is of course understandable; but that he is now administrator of the department that covers the whole of the province, covers the farm labour as well as the big industrial labour, covers the small grocery man's additional help that he may need in Reston or Woodlands or something like that as well as the retail clerks in Hudson's Bay or the T. Eaton Company, that there has to be a constant, you know, openness on the part of the Department of Labour to review the situations as they come up.

Mr. Chairman, I would consider that in the estimates as I read them that there are little if any significant changes. They would appear to be essentially the kind of changes, the normal escalating factors of rising wages and rising costs that accrue to all departments that account for the major portion of the, some two to three hundred thousand dollar increase in the Department of Labour. I will be asking specific questions on those areas where it would appear that this is not the case.

With those few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the Minister of Labour in his responsibilities that he faces in the coming year. I think he recognizes the challenge that he faces in carrying on a harmonious labour-management scene in the Province of Manitoba; and I recognize that this government, of course, is dedicated to improving at perhaps an accelerated pace the lot of the working man in this province and this places a double onus on the Minister, that in so doing that it be done with the kind of understanding, with the kind of consultation, with the kind of co-operation, that it does not necessarily break down the already referred to good relationship that exists in this province. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I also wish to thank the Honourable Minister in introducing his estimates to the House this morning. He was giving us quite a bit of information in respect to the labour situation at the present time. He was much longer than he was last Fall when he introduced his estimates and was quite brief at that time. I know that when the Minister was on this side of the House he was very critical of the government of that day in respect to the labour situation in this province, and I know after the Member for Inkster was elected and came to sit in this House he took over to some extent from the present Minister of Labour but as well the then member continued to be very critical of the government in many respects. So this morning I feel that the Minister did not need the eight months or so that he has now been

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) in that position to get acquainted, because he was very well acquainted with most aspects of the labour situation.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation on behalf of our party to all the civil servants in the Department of Labour because on any occasion or any opportunity that I have to deal with any civil servants in the Department of Labour, I've always had full co-operation and any information I needed I was always given. I don't think that the name of Mr. Tallin should also go unnoticed at the present time. I would like to associate myself with the words that have been mentioned by the Honourable Minister. I know that he certainly has made a great contribution and his work should be acknowledged. As well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilson of the Workmen's Compensation Board; I think that he was a dedicated servant as well. The new Chairman, Mr. Johnston, is I'm sure known to everyone in this House, and I think that he will do a good job in that position, and I would say that the selection was an appropriate one.

Mr. Chairman, last year I suggested that the Minister should look at labour legislation in view of probably combining some 23 Acts and updating it into one labour act. I know that many of the other provinces have done this but in Manitoba we're still dealing with many pieces of legislation and perhaps it's time to have one Act dealing with all aspects of labour.

I would also agree and concur with the Minister of Labour that the Woods Committee should continue. I think that they have played an important part in labour-management relations in this province and perhaps that's why the scene in Manitoba in respect to labour has been so favourable in the last few years. Maybe they have not been as fast in recommending many pieces of legislation as they should have but once the dialogue gets going it seems that there's a much better chance of reaching concensus and as a result they have made some very good recommendations. You may realize at the present time that some of the other provinces in Canada will be appointing a similar management-labour relations committee in their provinces as this House has appointed a few years ago. I think this committee has served a good purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the Minister has mentioned that the unemployment was only 2.5 percent during 1969 which was very favourable; but on the other hand when you look at our labour force which only increased by 1,000 from 372,000 to 373, I don't think that we can take very much satisfaction in that respect, because our labour force certainly has not increased no where near the national level and not to the extent that I believe it should have. So I think that we should be appreciative that there is low unemployment, on the other hand I think that there must be an indication here that many of our more skilled people are probably leaving the province to some other areas where they can get better wages and better income. I think that we in our party on many occasions have stated that the working man can best improve and protect his interests through strong, democratic, responsible and self regulating unions. I say "strong" because usually the weak ones cannot bargain on the same basis with the management; "democratic" because only in that way can the members ensure that their union works in their interests; "responsible" because a trade union like any other person or organization has to have a responsibility to society; and "self-regulating" because a trade union movement must build up within itself means by which it can correct abuses within the union. I think these are most important because failure to do this will lead to government intervention, and we have stated probably the least government intervention in this area is the best.

In the 1965 session of the Legislature the government passed legislation giving to the Labour Board powers to detect and to deal with unfair labour practices. I think this was good legislation and we in our group take some credit for it because it was my resolution that was introduced in this House and passed, where I asked that the Labour Board be required to deal with certification matters, and some two years later I think the Woods recommendation was almost along, word for word, the same lines as my resolution that was passed in the House and then the legislation was recommended to this House and I believe a year later or so it was passed.

Also, Mr. Chairman, we opposed the government secret strike vote when it became law in 1962. We proposed to the Legislature at that time that it be replaced by a union conducted strike vote. In 1966 Woods Committee also recommended along the same lines and I believe it was passed in 1966 and became law.

I will not attempt to cover all areas in the field of Labour, but I wish to deal briefly on such items as human rights commission, minimum wage, workmen's compensation, vacation

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) pay, statutory holidays, hours of work per week, industrial safety and sheltered workshops.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this human rights legislation will outlaw discrimination in accommodation because of sex, religion, colour, race or nationality; discrimination in employment because of sex, religion, colour, race or nationality or ancestry; that it will outlaw discrimination in employment because of age. I understand that in the United States across the line they have moved in this area where under the new labour laws, Discrimination in Employment Act now prohibits such advertising in the papers as "young, middle-aged, or girl or boy," and also eliminates specifically stating any age group such as 40 to 65, but it does spell out and gives guidelines where you can specify qualifications and educational requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the Human Rights Commission should also outlaw discrimination in employment because of union activity and it should outlaw discrimination by union of a member because of sex, religion, colour, nationality or ancestry as well. I don't know if the members are aware, I had the opportunity some years back to speak on the Human Rights Commission under the labour legislation laws and at that time I mentioned some of these points, so I just want to bring them to the attention of the Minister at this time.

I think also a declaration recognizing the right of any member of a professional or trade body or trade union to a reasonable opportunity to participate in the affairs thereof and to reasonable means of redress from complaints against such professional bodies or trade unions, I think this must be specified as well.

Turning to something else, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few things on the minimum wage and I hope that some of the members will not be accusing me that the minimum wage will chase away industry. I have an article here: "Low Wages not a Selling Point for a Healthy Area", and I would like to point that low wages - this is an article from the Globe and Mail in respect to Atlantic provinces - "Low wages as a selling point in attracting new industry is short-sighted" - and I'm quoting from the Globe and Mail. "'Low wages do not mean low labour costs,' said Mr. J. A. Norton, an economist with the United Steelworkers of America. 'They attract dying or marginal industries with low productivity. Many of them will fold if wages increase. The Atlantic Provinces can effect significant improvement in income levels if the region attracts high productivity, high wage industries with higher skills and higher educational demands. There is very little that labour or management can do to close the gap because the fault lies in the corporate structure and the tariff policy in Canada.'"

Our COMEF report states the same thing, and was very critical of the wages paid in this province. In fact it went further to state that usually the wage is only applied mostly where it is not unionized, in the service industries which will not affect our economic conditions because these are the commodities that are not exported. It is more in the service industry which is flexible and the wages can be raised. Mr. Chairman, we cannot ask people to work at rates which require them to live in poverty, at rates below which can be obtained on welfare, and at the present time this is the case. As you know, the welfare schedule of the city of Winnipeg is higher than the present minimum wage.

Furthermore, Manitoba does not keep its working people because it is not paying them to stay. They move to other parts of Canada where they can earn more money. I think it is not realistic for a married man with a family to live on \$54.00 per week with the living costs in this province as high as it is today. I am sure that everyone will appreciate a proper minimum wage will not solve all the problems for the worker and his family. He will not be able to save any money for emergencies; it will not provide housing when low cost housing is not available; but I think it will replace the feeling amongst many workers that they are being exploited, which probably in many cases this is not the case.

I feel that we must recognize the limitations of any minimum wage. It is the amount earned in the year that really counts. The workers in the city find themselves in the position of being the fourth highest cost of living center according to the DBS of all the major cities in Canada, with income almost the lowest on the totem pole, or next I believe to the Maritimes and parts of Quebec. Even a greater portion of Quebec is higher than the per capita income that our city has. So I feel it is time that we have a decent minimum wage in this province.

Mr. Chairman, last year we were able to deal, or last fall, with the Workmen's Compensation Act. I am trying to deal with Section 31, Wage Ceilings, which should be increased so that the maximum annual payment that injured workers can receive is at least \$7,000. I think the present maximum ceiling is \$6,600, because you don't get the benefit of your full salary when you are on compensation. You are only entitled to 75 percent of your total income,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) so sometimes I think this is confusing to many people, or even members in this House, when we talk of \$7,000, you know, or \$6,600 maximum, without pointing up the 75 percent, they think they are getting their full salary and this is not the case. Let's assume a worker is receiving \$600 a month. If on compensation, he receives \$450 because of the 75 percent factor. If he is killed his widow will receive \$120 pension in that household. This is the other point that I wish to bring to your attention, Mr. Minister. I think Section 23, subsection (d), monthly allowances to widows - they were increased I know by \$20.00 per month - I don't think it is realistic at the present time with the present cost of living in this province.

The other point that I wish to raise at the present time, Mr. Chairman, is in connection with decisions of the Workmen's Compensation. I have not had too many complaints in the last little while, but last fall and last year I had very many and I know there are still a couple of letters that I have to deal with at the present time, and at that time I recommended to the House I would like to see the Attorney-General appoint an independent advisor to assist workers in preparing and presenting appeals against decisions of the Board. I think this would be of great assistance to many of our workers who wish to appeal decisions and I understand this is in operation in the Province of Ontario. Perhaps the Minister can take a look at this and see if it would be feasible. I don't think this would involve any cost back. If it would it would be very small because I don't feel that it would require a full time person in this case.

Mr. Chairman, last year I prepared a resolution or presented a resolution to the House asking for longer vacations with pay, and perhaps the Minister has something in that respect according to the Throne Speech, because I feel it is the established practice that some other provinces at the present time are giving longer vacations with pay where the worker has worked for at least five years with the same employer. I am sure that there would be very little opposition from anyone or any industry in this respect, because I feel once you have been able to keep an employee for five years he must be a good employee, and in the long run I think it would be beneficial to industry to do this. It is a known fact that more skilled employees leave this province to work in other areas where better wages and other benefits can be obtained. But I will not be too critical at this time, I shall await the legislation during this session.

Mr. Chairman, the other point that I wish to make at this time is I also introduced a resolution during the last session, and it's on the Order Paper now, standing on the Order Paper in respect to the Employment Standards Act. The current Employment Standards Act makes no provision for payment to employees for any of the general holidays not worked. Now this omission results in a penalty in the form of lost wages to some workers in this province, Mr. Chairman, I may say it may be very small, the percentage is very small, but all it would do is it would clarify the present legislation and I don't think that there would be any objection. As a matter of fact, people that I talked to, to all industries, I see no objection to this proposal and I cannot see why the Minister did not decide even to move on this last session. What actually I am saying here, Mr. Chairman, is that every worker must get paid for statutory holidays, and I have also recommended that perhaps the statutory holidays be increased from seven to nine to include Boxing Day and the first civic holiday in August which we celebrate anyhow, and I can't see why if we do celebrate it, it is a civic holiday, why not make it statutory.

The other point that the Minister did not mention when he introduced his estimates is the hours in one work week. I think it's established practice in Canada, and also many of the collective agreements provide for five day 40-hour week, with 1 1/2 times for any overtime or extra time. The Federal Government labour code at the present time authorizes time and one half for any work done by an employee over 40 hours a week. I know that all members in this Assembly recognize the importance of keeping highly skilled people in this province. I am told, and I have checked out and investigated, and many of your big department stores in the city I believe are even at the present time working an hour or so less than the 40 hours, and I cannot see who this would affect. With the employment situation as it is in Canada at the present time, not only this government but all governments across the country will have to move in this direction to cut the short week. The 40-hour week is an established practice and I cannot see why it shouldn't be established as law in this province.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to make, and I'll be quite brief in this area, and that's industrial safety. I think the community benefits through greater industrial efficiency of our labour force in the form of savings. However, one cannot measure the benefits of saving

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) a human life and health. I think the industries would find profit accrue from safety programs and I am sure that employer relations benefit when workers are made aware that there is an urgent and personal interest in their welfare. The cost of workmen's compensation, which is borne by the consumer and the taxpayers, which is a complete non-productive expense, would be saved and I think this last year or so we've had, if I am not mistaken, the industrial accidents, particularly excavations and so on, was on the increase and I think this is an area that the Minister should check into. I think the work force of the community has a right to an environment in which it can work safely. I feel we are short of this goal. Our safety inspection should be also increased. I did not have the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to study the labour report; I wish it would have been tabled a few days ago. It was just given to us yesterday so I had no opportunity to check the statistics or really look at it, but I feel that from the reports that I get this is a problem at the present time and I think we should do something in this area.

The other point that I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is the sheltered workshop program which provides employment for those that are unable to compete on the open labour market. This provides short term work in which assessment of vocational potential can be assessed with a view to assisting the handicapped person and his progress towards a productive vocational status. Now I wonder if the Minister can give us more information in respect to the sheltered workshops. I know that I have had on quite a few occasions people come to see me in this area and there are some problems, but I think it certainly is a most useful operation and I think, if anything, this is one area that should definitely be extended.

I have already mentioned about the college and student employment. Last year the university students had great difficulty in finding summer employment. I know at the present time there are programs such as Manpower, Chambers of Commerce, some private industries and other agencies which offer some assistance for summer employment to university students, but I feel that the provincial government must provide financial help to operate agencies on all campuses, and I'm sure that the government departments can reserve employment for university and secondary students in order to assist them to be able to earn during the summer for the purpose of being able to continue their education and to be able to pay their university fees. I know that this will not solve the whole problem but it certainly will be of some assistance to them.

The other point I wish to make at this time is violation of the labour laws. Mr. Chairman, we must have sufficient inspectors to deal with violations of labour laws. The workers must receive prompt government action on all their complaints if the intent of the law is to be observed and the minimum wage, overtime, equal pay for equal work provisions are to have any meaning at all. I wonder at the present time, is there anyone checking into this area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the honourable member would like to continue later?

MR. PATRICK: I just have about half a minute, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, proceed.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, the only other point that I wish to make at this time is in the area of automation. I know that there are workers being displaced by automation and I think it is the responsibility of the government and everyone concerned to see that these people are retrained or placed in, or offered some other jobs because I don't think that any society should permit workers to be made jobless through no fault of their own. At the present time, it has come to my attention just the other day that at the CBC some 18 or 19 employees were displaced because the contract was let to somebody else to clean the facilities - it's the janitor work - and these people are in the age group where they would have a difficult time getting other employment. I think that it's most --(Interjection)-- well there's many industries that are doing the same thing. The problem at the present time that we're facing, Mr. Chairman, is that in the last few years a great percentage of our employment has been picked up and the slack has been picked up by your service industries, and at the present time I think the service industries have almost reached the maximum or the saturation point right across Canada, which they will not be able to pick up the slack, so we'll find ourselves in a position that there will be people who are unemployed and I think that this is an area that the government must effectively do something. I think it's our responsibility that any displaced people by automation have an opportunity to be retrained and have some assistance from the government.

So these are some of the points that I wish to make at this present time and I will have some others later on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 12:30; I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.